

# $4\pi$ Decay Modes of the $f_0(1500)$ Resonance

M. Strohmeier-Prešiček, T. Gutsche, Amand Faessler

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Tübingen,*

*Auf der Morgenstelle 14, 72076 Tübingen, Germany*

and

R. Vinh Mau

*Division de Physique Théorique, Institut de Physique Nucléaire, 91406 Orsay Cedex, France*

*and LPTPE, Université P. et M. Curie, 4 Place Jussieu, 75230 Paris Cedex, France*

## Abstract

We investigate the two-body decay modes  $\rho\rho$ ,  $\pi\pi^*(1300)$  and  $\sigma\sigma$  of the  $f_0(1500)$ , all leading to the  $4\pi$  decay channel, in a three-state mixing scheme, where the  $f_0(1500)$  is a mixture of the lowest-lying scalar glueball with the nearby isoscalar states of the  $0^{++} Q\bar{Q}$  nonet. In the leading order of this scheme, the decay mechanism of the  $f_0(1500)$  proceeds dominantly via its quarkonia components, which can be described in the framework of the  $^3P_0 Q\bar{Q}$  pair creation model. We predict the hierarchy of decay branching ratios  $B$  with  $B(\rho\rho) \gtrsim B(\pi\pi) \gtrsim B(\sigma\sigma) > B(\pi\pi^*)$ , providing a key signature for the proposed mixing scheme in this leading order approach.

PACS: 13.25.Jx, 12.39.Mk, 1440.Cs

Keywords: scalar glueball, hadronic decay of mesons, hadron spectroscopy

Recently, there has been growing attention, both experimental and theoretical, on the possible existence of glueball states. A scalar-isoscalar resonance  $f_0(1500)$  is clearly established by Crystal Barrel at LEAR [1, 2] in proton-antiproton annihilation, which is regarded as a rich gluon production mechanism with favored coupling to glueballs [3]. The main interest in the  $f_0(1500)$  as a candidate reflecting the intrusion of a glueball state in the scalar-isoscalar meson spectrum rests on several phenomenological and theoretical observations. Lattice QCD, in the quenched approximation [4], predicts the lightest glueball to be a scalar, lying in the mass range of 1500-1700 MeV. Although the decay pattern of the  $f_0(1500)$  into two pseudoscalar mesons is compatible with a quarkonium state  $n\bar{n} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(u\bar{u} + d\bar{d})$  in the scalar  $Q\bar{Q}$  nonet, the observed total width of  $\Gamma \approx 120 \text{ MeV}$  is in conflict with naive quark model expectations of  $\Gamma \geq 500 \text{ MeV}$  [5]. Moreover, it is now believed [1, 6], that the  $f_0(1370)$  state occupies the corresponding position in the scalar nonet, with decay branching ratios and total width consistent with a dominant  $n\bar{n}$  structure. As the  $f_0(1500)$  cannot be accommodated as a radial excitation of the scalar  $^3P_0$  nonet [7], it appears as an excess state in the  $Q\bar{Q}$  systematics.

In the analysis of the partial decay widths into two pseudoscalar mesons, several schemes have been proposed to attribute at least a partial glueball nature to the  $f_0(1500)$  state [6, 8, 9], although quantitative predictions for its glueball content differ sizably. In the scenario proposed by Ref. [6] the pure glueball is mixed with the  $n\bar{n}$  and  $s\bar{s}$  states of the scalar  $^3P_0$  nonet. The mixture leads to three scalar states with nearly equal glueball strength, identified with the  $f_0(1370)$ ,  $f_0(1500)$  and an additional state around 1700 MeV which can possibly be the  $f_{J=0,2}(1710)$ . It is argued that in the leading order of strong coupling QCD, the hadronic two meson decay proceeds dominantly via the  $Q\bar{Q}$ - components of the  $f_0(1500)$ , if the Fock states of final state isoscalar mesons contain no gluonic component. Neglecting an intrinsic violation of flavor symmetry, the model can explain the decay pattern of the  $f_0(1500)$  into two pseudoscalar mesons. In particular, the experimental weak  $K\bar{K}$  decay mode is obtained from the destructive interference between the admixed  $n\bar{n}$  and  $s\bar{s}$  modes.

There are hints that the scalar  $s\bar{s}$  state may have a lower mass than the scalar glueball motivating another three-state mixing model with this level ordering [9]. In this scenario the glueball component dominantly resides in the  $f_J(1710)$  with the  $f_0(1500)$  remaining as a nearly pure quarkonium state, but the destructive interference between the  $n\bar{n}$  and  $s\bar{s}$  flavors for the  $f_0(1500)$  still remains. For this reason, both analyses of Refs. [6] and [9] are very similar for the decay of  $f_0(1500)$  into two pseudoscalar mesons [6].

In the present work, we go beyond the two pseudoscalar meson decay modes and study

the predictions of the three-state mixing schemes of Refs. [6, 9] in the  $4\pi$  decay modes. We derive the decay pattern of the  $f_0(1500)$  into the two-body decay channels  $\rho\rho$ ,  $\pi\pi^*(1300)$  and  $\sigma\sigma$  ( $\sigma$  is the broad  $\pi\pi$  S-wave resonance). They all contribute to the  $4\pi$  decay rate, and we calculate their relative ratios to that of the  $2\pi$  decay channel. The two-body decay modes leading to the  $4\pi$  final state have the advantage that, in the decay dynamics, no  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry breaking and mixing angles for the meson nonets in the decay channel are needed. This reduces the uncertainties occurring in the analysis of the two pseudoscalar meson decays.

*The model* - As mentioned earlier, the hadronic decay of the admixed  $f_0(1500)$  is dominated by the  $Q\bar{Q}$  components. The coupling of the scalar  $Q\bar{Q}$  components to the final two-meson states can be calculated in the non-relativistic  $Q\bar{Q}$  pair creation  $^3P_0$  model [10], in which the  $Q\bar{Q}$  pairs are created with vacuum quantum numbers. The relevant OZI-allowed quark line diagram, describing the flavor flux from the initial  $Q\bar{Q}$  component of the  $f_0(1500)$  to the two meson final states BC ( $=\pi\pi$ ,  $\rho\rho$ ,  $\sigma\sigma$  and  $\pi\pi^*(1300)$ ) is shown in the figure. The details of all the following formulae can be found in Refs. [5, 7, 10, 11]. The transition dynamics is governed by the nonperturbative  $Q\bar{Q}$   $^3P_0$  vertex:

$$V_{3P_0}^{(34)} = \lambda \delta(\mathbf{p}_4 + \mathbf{p}_3) \left[ \mathcal{Y}_{1\mu}^*(\mathbf{p}_4 - \mathbf{p}_3) \otimes \sigma_{-\mu}^{(43)\dagger} \right]_{00} \mathbf{1}_F^{(43)} \mathbf{1}_C^{(43)}, \quad (1)$$

$\mathbf{p}_{3(4)}$  are the momenta of the created  $Q\bar{Q}$  pair and  $\mathcal{Y}_{1\mu}^*(\mathbf{p}) = |\mathbf{p}| Y_{1\mu}^*(\hat{\mathbf{p}})$ . The identity operators  $\mathbf{1}_F$  and  $\mathbf{1}_C$  project onto singlet states in flavor and color space, respectively. The dimensionless parameter  $\lambda$  corresponds to the strength of the transition, which in turn is related to the probability for  $Q\bar{Q}$  pair creation out of the hadronic vacuum. Since for the considered final states BC no  $s\bar{s}$  pair creation is involved  $\lambda$  is flavor independent. With harmonic oscillator wave functions for the quark clusters, the scalar  $Q\bar{Q}$ -component of the  $f_0(1500)$  is given as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{f_0}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) &= \psi_{S_{f_0}=1, l_{f_0}=1, J_{f_0}=0}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) \chi_F^{f_0} \chi_C^{f_0} \\ &= (-i) \left[ \frac{2R_{f_0}^5}{3\sqrt{\pi}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta(\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{8} R_{f_0}^2 (\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{p}_2)^2 \right\} \\ &\quad \cdot [\chi_{S=1}(12) \otimes \mathcal{Y}_{l=1}(\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{p}_2)]_{J=0} \chi_F^{f_0} \chi_C^{f_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$R_{f_0}$  is a size parameter, the intrinsic spin  $\chi_{S=1}$  of the  $Q\bar{Q}$  pair is coupled with relative orbital angular momentum  $l = 1$  to the  $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$  state,  $\chi_C$  denotes the color wave function and the effective flavor part  $\chi_F^{f_0}$  is given by  $\chi_F^{f_0} = \xi(n\bar{n})$ , where  $\xi$  represents the amplitude for the  $n\bar{n}$  component in the three-state mixing scheme. In the same way, for the final state mesons  $\sigma$  and  $\pi^*$  (which is the first radial excitation of the  $\pi$  with  $n_{\pi^*} = 1$ ) with decay momentum  $\mathbf{K}$  and intrinsic quark momenta  $\mathbf{p}_{i(j)}$ , the wave functions are

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_\sigma(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) &= \psi_{S_\sigma=1, l_\sigma=1, J_\sigma=0}(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) \chi_F^\sigma \chi_C^\sigma \\
&= (-i) \left[ \frac{2R_\sigma^5}{3\sqrt{\pi}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta(\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}_j - \mathbf{K}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{8} R_\sigma^2 (\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)^2 \right\} \\
&\quad \cdot [\chi_{S_\sigma=1}(ij) \otimes \mathcal{Y}_{l_\sigma=1}(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)]_{J_\sigma=0} \chi_F^\sigma \chi_C^\sigma,
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{\pi^*}(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) &= \psi_{n_{\pi^*}=1, S_{\pi^*}=0, l_{\pi^*}=0, J_{\pi^*}=0}(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) \chi_F^{\pi^*} \chi_C^{\pi^*} \\
&= (-) \left[ \frac{8R_{\pi^*}^3}{3\sqrt{\pi}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta(\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}_j - \mathbf{K}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{8} R_{\pi^*}^2 (\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)^2 \right\} \\
&\quad \cdot L_{n_{\pi^*}=1}^{1/2} \left( \frac{R_{\pi^*}^2}{4} (\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)^2 \right) [\chi_{S_{\pi^*}=0}(ij) \otimes Y_{l_{\pi^*}=0}(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)]_{J_{\pi^*}=0} \chi_F^{\pi^*} \chi_C^{\pi^*}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with the Laguerre polynomial  $L_{n=1}^{1/2}(p) = 3/2 - p$ . Here,  $\sigma$  is effectively described by an isoscalar  ${}^3P_0$   $Q\bar{Q}$  state. The S-wave mesons  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  are described by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{\pi(\rho)}(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) &= \psi_{S_{\pi(\rho)}, l_{\pi(\rho)}=0, J_{\pi(\rho)}}(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) \chi_F^{\pi(\rho)} \chi_C^{\pi(\rho)} \\
&= \left[ \frac{4R_{\pi(\rho)}^3}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta(\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}_j - \mathbf{K}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{8} R_{\pi(\rho)}^2 (\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)^2 \right\} \\
&\quad \cdot [\chi_{S_{\pi(\rho)}}(ij) \otimes Y_{l_{\pi(\rho)}=0}(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)]_{J_{\pi(\rho)}} \chi_F^{\pi(\rho)} \chi_C^{\pi(\rho)}
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

with  $S_\pi = J_\pi = 0, S_\rho = J_\rho = 1$ . The size parameters for  $\pi$  and  $\pi^*$  have to fulfill the relation  $R_\pi = R_{\pi^*}$  due to orthogonality of the wave functions.

The transition amplitude for the process  $f_0(1500) \rightarrow BC$  of the figure is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
T &= \langle \Psi_B^{(13)}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_3) \Psi_C^{(42)}(\mathbf{p}_4, \mathbf{p}_2) | V_{3P_0}^{(34)} | \Psi_{f_0}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) \rangle \\
&= T_{SS}^{f_0 \rightarrow BC} T_F^{f_0 \rightarrow BC} T_C^{f_0 \rightarrow BC}
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The color part  $T_C$  is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ , and the spin-spatial part  $T_{SS}^{f_0 \rightarrow BC}$  is given with the appropriate wave functions of Eqs. (2)-(5) as

$$T_{SS}^{f_0 \rightarrow BC} = \int \prod_{i=1, \dots, 4} d\mathbf{p}_i \psi_{S_B l_B J_B}^\dagger(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_3) \psi_{S_C l_C J_C}^\dagger(\mathbf{p}_4, \mathbf{p}_2) V_{3P_0}^{(34)} \psi_{S_{f_0}=1, l_{f_0}=1, J_{f_0}=0}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2), \tag{7}$$

where the internal quark momenta are integrated over and evaluation of the integral (7) is done analytically [10]. The various flavor factors  $T_F^{(f_0 \rightarrow BC)}$  are indicated in the table. Using relativistic phase space, the partial decay width  $\Gamma_{f_0 \rightarrow BC}$  is written as

$$\Gamma_{f_0 \rightarrow BC} = 2\pi \frac{E_B E_C}{M_{f_0}} K \int d\Omega_K |T(\mathbf{K})|^2 \tag{8}$$

with decay momentum  $|\mathbf{K}| = K$  and where  $E_i = \sqrt{M_i^2 + \mathbf{K}^2}$  and  $M_i$  (i=B,C) are energy and mass of the outgoing meson i. Analytical evaluation of Eq. (8) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{f_0 \rightarrow \sigma\sigma} = & \lambda^2 \frac{E_\sigma^2}{M_{f_0}} \frac{16}{81\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{R_{f_0}^5 R_\sigma^{10}}{(R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_\sigma^2)^7} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{R_{f_0}^2 R_\sigma^2}{R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_\sigma^2} \right) K^2 \right\} \\ & \cdot |T_F^{f_0 \rightarrow \sigma\sigma}|^2 K \left[ 60 + \frac{11R_{f_0}^4 + 4R_\sigma^2(R_{f_0}^2 + R_\sigma^2)}{(R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_\sigma^2)} K^2 \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{R_{f_0}^4 R_\sigma^2 (R_{f_0}^2 + R_\sigma^2)}{(R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_\sigma^2)^2} K^4 \right]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{f_0 \rightarrow \pi^* \pi} = & \lambda^2 \frac{E_{\pi^*} E_\pi}{M_{f_0}} \frac{8}{27\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{R_{f_0}^5 R_\pi^6}{(R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_\pi^2)^7} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{R_{f_0}^2 R_\pi^2}{R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_\pi^2} \right) K^2 \right\} \\ & \cdot |T_F^{f_0 \rightarrow \pi^* \pi}|^2 K \left[ (18R_{f_0}^2 - 24R_\pi^2) - \frac{R_{f_0}^2 R_\pi^2 (13R_{f_0}^2 + 6R_\pi^2)}{(R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_\pi^2)} K^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{R_{f_0}^4 R_\pi^4 (R_{f_0}^2 + R_\pi^2)}{(R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_\pi^2)^2} K^4 \right]^2 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi(\rho\rho)} = & \lambda^2 \frac{E_{\pi(\rho)}^2}{M_{f_0}} \frac{64}{A\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{R_{f_0}^5 R_{\pi(\rho)}^6}{(R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_{\pi(\rho)}^2)^5} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{R_{f_0}^2 R_{\pi(\rho)}^2}{R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_{\pi(\rho)}^2} \right) K_{\pi(\rho)}^2 \right\} \\ & \cdot |T_F^{f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi}|^2 K_{\pi(\rho)} \left[ 1 - \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{R_{\pi(\rho)}^2 (R_{f_0}^2 + R_{\pi(\rho)}^2)}{R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_{\pi(\rho)}^2} \right) K_{\pi(\rho)}^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{R_{\pi(\rho)}^2 (R_{f_0}^2 + R_{\pi(\rho)}^2)}{R_{f_0}^2 + 2R_{\pi(\rho)}^2} \right)^2 K_{\pi(\rho)}^4 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with  $A = 1, B = 9$  for  $f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi$  and  $A = 3, B = 1$  for  $f_0 \rightarrow \rho\rho$ . For the broad mesons  $f_0(1500), \pi^*(1300), \rho(770)$  and  $\sigma(760)$  we average over the mass spectrum  $f(m)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{f_0 \rightarrow BC} &= \int dm_{f_0} dm_B dm_C \Gamma_{f_0 \rightarrow BC}(m_{f_0}, m_B, m_C) f(m_{f_0}) f(m_B) f(m_C) \\ f(m) &\propto \frac{(\Gamma_i/2)^2}{(m - M_i)^2 + (\Gamma_i/2)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with a proper threshold cutoff introduced as in Ref. [12]. Masses  $M_i$  and widths  $\Gamma_i$  are taken from the Particle Data Group. They are well defined except  $\Gamma_{\pi^*}$  which is  $(400 \pm 200) \text{ MeV}$ . We parameterize the mass distribution of the scalar-isoscalar  $\sigma$  meson as in Ref. [13] ( $M_\sigma = 760 \text{ MeV}$ ,  $\Gamma_\sigma = 640 \text{ MeV}$ ). The partial decay widths of all  $4\pi$  channels and also the  $2\pi$  mode scale with  $(\xi \cdot \lambda)^2$ . The predictions for relative branching ratios are therefore independent of

any particular three-state mixing scheme [6, 9], specified by the explicit value of  $\xi$ . The only parameters left in the model are the size parameters  $R_\pi, R_\rho, R_\sigma$  and  $R_{f_0}$  of the meson wave functions. Assuming a common oscillator parameter for all mesons, meson decay analyses yield  $R = 2.5 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$  [5, 11]. These values will be referred to as set 1. In Ref. [6], for the two pseudoscalar meson decay modes, differences in size parameters for the  $Q\bar{Q}$  states are taken into account, with  $R(^3P_0) = 2.0 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$  and  $R(^1S_0) = 2.5 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$  (set 2). A recent full scale analysis of tensor meson decays [14] yields  $R_\pi = R_\rho = 3.69 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ , suggesting  $R(^3P_0) \approx 3.7 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$  (set 3). There is no reliable constraint for  $R_\sigma$ ; since  $\sigma$  represents a broad  $\pi\pi$  S-wave resonance,  $R_\sigma \geq R_\pi$  is reasonable. We resort to these different sets of values to study the sensitivity of the different observables to this input leading to an effective error band of the decay model.

*Results* - If we adopt  $R_\pi = R_\sigma$  and  $\Gamma_{\pi^*} = 400 \text{ MeV}$  we obtain for the  $f_0 \rightarrow BC$  decays the following ratios:

$$B(\pi\pi) : B(\rho\rho) : B(\sigma\sigma) : B(\pi^*\pi) = \begin{cases} 1 & : 1.62 & : 0.93 & : 0.33 & \text{with set 1} \\ 1 & : 1.04 & : 0.76 & : 0.56 & \text{with set 2} \\ 1 & : 0.92 & : 0.28 & : 0.19 & \text{with set 3} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

We can see that all decay rates reveal a rather strong dependence on the size parameters. However, even when we vary the size parameters in a rather wide range, the  $4\pi$  decay modes of the  $f_0(1500)$  always follow the decay pattern

$$B(\pi^*\pi) < B(\sigma\sigma) \lesssim B(\pi\pi) \lesssim B(\rho\rho) \quad (14)$$

This hierarchy of the decay modes remains also unaltered when taking into account the experimental uncertainty of  $\Gamma_{\pi^*}$  by  $\pm 200 \text{ MeV}$ . Similarly, a variation of the  $\sigma$  size parameter in the range  $R_\pi \leq R_\sigma \leq 6.0 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$  does not change the order (14). This constitutes a stable prediction of the model. Experimental data concerning the  $4\pi$  decay mode of the  $f_0(1500)$  and its separation into the contributions of the individual two-body channels are still incomplete. Recently, Crystal Barrel observed the  $f_0(1500)$  in its  $4\pi^0$  decay mode in the annihilation reaction  $p\bar{p} \rightarrow 5\pi^0$  at rest [15]. With their results for  $f_0(1500) \rightarrow \pi\pi$ , given by a single channel ( $p\bar{p} \rightarrow 3\pi^0$ ) [1] and, more consistently, by a coupled channel analysis ( $p\bar{p} \rightarrow \pi^0\eta\eta$ ,  $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$  and  $3\pi^0$ ) [16], the ratio  $r$  is found to be

$$r = \frac{B(f_0(1500) \rightarrow 4\pi)}{B(f_0(1500) \rightarrow 2\pi)} = \begin{cases} 3.4 \pm 0.8 & [15] \\ 2.1 \pm 0.6 & [17] \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where the contribution of the  $\rho\rho$  intermediate state is not included in  $B(f_0(1500) \rightarrow 4\pi)$ . However, an alternative multi-channel analysis [18], resulting in a partial decay width of  $\Gamma_{\pi\pi} = 60 \pm 12 \text{ MeV}$  and a total width of  $\Gamma = 132 \pm 15 \text{ MeV}$  for the  $f_0(1500)$  seems to indicate a ratio of  $r$  closer to 1. For the three parameter sets and using  $\Gamma_{\pi^*} = 400 \text{ MeV}$ ,  $B(\pi^* \rightarrow \sigma\pi) = 0.6$ , and  $R_\sigma = R_\pi$ , our calculation gives

$$r = \frac{B(f_0 \rightarrow 4\pi)}{B(f_0 \rightarrow 2\pi)} = \begin{cases} 1.13 & \text{for set 1} \\ 1.09 & \text{for set 2} \\ 0.40 & \text{for set 3} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

to be compared to the experimental number of Eq. (15). Again, taking into account the experimental uncertainties in  $\Gamma_{\pi^*}$  and in  $B(\pi^* \rightarrow \sigma\pi)$  by  $\pm 0.2$  the results (16) are changed by less than 10%. A variation of  $R_\sigma$  from the value of  $R_\pi$  to  $6 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$  leads to ranges of predictions for  $r$  of  $0.41 - 1.21$ ,  $0.32 - 1.20$  and  $0.26 - 0.45$ , for the three parameter sets respectively. Even when one allows strong variations in the size parameters the theoretical predictions for  $r$  are lower than the experimental result by at least a factor of two. Although in Ref. [15], the final states  $\sigma\sigma$  and  $\pi\pi^*$  contribute with similar intensities to the  $4\pi^0$  mode, precise values for the respective decay branching ratios cannot be given due to interference effects. Furthermore, preliminary results [19] of an analysis of  $p\bar{p} \rightarrow 5\pi$  including charged state combinations of  $\pi$ , seem to indicate that the  $\sigma\sigma$  decay is dominating over the  $\rho\rho$  decay.

In summary, we have investigated the glueball-quarkonia mixing scheme of Refs. [6, 9] in the  $f_0(1500)$  decay into  $\sigma\sigma$ ,  $\rho\rho$ ,  $\pi^*\pi$  and  $\pi\pi$  final states. The leading order hadronic decay mechanism, as described in Ref. [6], proceeds both by the  $Q\bar{Q}$  and the gluonic component of the  $f_0(1500)$ ; latter process, where the glueball decays into a pair of glueballs, can feed final states with isoscalar mesons, possessing a sizable gluonic component. Given the modelling of  $\sigma$  as a  $^3P_0 \text{ } Q\bar{Q}$  state, where gluonic components are neglected, for the leading order decay mechanism we predict a decay pattern of  $4\pi$  modes, where the  $\rho\rho$  channel dominates. This is in conflict with preliminary experimental results [19], where the  $\rho\rho$  decay mode is suppressed. For the  $4\pi/2\pi$  decay ratio the result we obtain is insufficient to fully explain the experimental result of Eq. (15). Another analysis of the  $f_0(1500)$  decays [18] seems to indicate that the ratio of Eq. (15) is considerably lower, reducing the disagreement with the theoretical results. We stress that the decay pattern developed here is common to a simple  $n\bar{n}$  state and to the mixed  $f_0(1500)$ , where its  $s\bar{s}$  configuration does not couple to the  $4\pi$  modes. If the experimental qualitative ordering of the  $f_0(1500)$  decay rates  $B(4\pi) > B(2\pi)$  and  $B(\sigma\sigma) > B(\rho\rho)$  is confirmed, the decay scheme developed here should be modified by taking

into account an additional direct coupling of the gluonic component of the  $f_0(1500)$  state to the  $4\pi$  decay channels; for example, leading order contributions can enhance the  $\sigma\sigma$  decay mode [6], while higher order decay mechanisms can contribute to all  $4\pi$  decay channels. Thus an accurate experimental determination of the  $4\pi$  decay modes of the  $f_0(1500)$  provides an additional sensitive signal for the need to go beyond a pure  $Q\bar{Q}$  consideration of the  $f_0(1500)$ , possibly revealing the significant glueball configuration claimed to reside in this state.

This work was supported in part by the Graduiertenkolleg "Struktur und Wechselwirkung von Hadronen und Kernen" (DFG Mu705/3), by a grant of the Deutsches Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (contract No. 06 Tü 887) and by the PROCOPE cooperation project (No. 96043).



## References

- [1] C. Amsler et al., Phys. Lett. B342, 433 (1995); B291, 347 (1992); B340, 259 (1994)
- [2] V.V. Anisovich et al., Phys. Lett. B323, 233 (1994).
- [3] F.E. Close, Rep. Prog. Phys. 51, 833 (1988).
- [4] G. Bali et al., Phys. Lett. B309, 378 (1993); H. Chen, J. Sexton, A. Vaccarino and D. Weingarten, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 34, 357 (1994).
- [5] R. Kokoski and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D35, 907 (1987); S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D32, 189 (1985).
- [6] C. Amsler and F.E. Close, Phys. Lett. B353, 385 (1996); Phys. Rev. D53, 295 (1996); F.E. Close, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 56A, 248 (1997).
- [7] T. Barnes et al., Phys. Rev. D55, 4157 (1997).
- [8] V.V. Anisovich et al., Phys. Lett. B364, 195 (1995).
- [9] D. Weingarten, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 53, 232 (1997).
- [10] A. Le Yaouanc et al., Hadron transitions in the quark model, Gordon and Breach, Amsterdam (1988).
- [11] E. S. Ackley and T. Barnes, Phys. Rev. D54, 6811 (1996); P. Geiger and E. S. Swanson, Phys. Rev. D50, 6855 (1994).
- [12] M. Maruyama, S. Furui and A. Faessler, Nucl. Phys. A472, 643 (1987).
- [13] M. Nagels et al., Phys. Rev. D12, 744 (1975).
- [14] T. Gutsche et al., in preparation.
- [15] C. Amsler et al., Phys. Lett. B380, 453 (1996).
- [16] C. Amsler et al., Phys. Lett. B355, 425 (1995).
- [17] C. Amsler, hep-ex/9708025.
- [18] A. Abele et al., Nucl. Phys. A609, 562 (1996).
- [19] U. Thoma, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 56A, 216 (1997).

Table: Flavor matrix elements for the decay modes  $f_0 \rightarrow BC$ .

| decay                              | $ T_F^{(f_0 \rightarrow BC)} ^2 / \xi^2$ |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| $f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi(\rho\rho)$ | 3                                        |
| $f_0 \rightarrow \pi\pi^*$         | 6                                        |
| $f_0 \rightarrow \sigma\sigma$     | 1                                        |

Figure: Decay of the  $Q\bar{Q}$  component of the  $f_0$  into two mesons BC. The dot indicates the  $Q\bar{Q} {}^3P_0$  vertex.

